arXiv:physics/0110082v1 [physics.gen-ph] 29 Oct 2001

Comment on "Multiple scattering in a reflecting cavity: Application to fish counting in a tank [J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 109, 2587-2597 (2001)]"

Zhen Ye[1] and Dezhang Chu[2]
[1] *Wave Phenomena Laboratory, Department of Physics, National Central University, Chung-li, Taiwan 32054*
[2] *Department of Applied Ocean Physics and Engineering, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, Woods Hole, MA 02543*
(February 2, 2008)

This paper presents a comment on the recent work on fish counting in a tank (J. Acoust. Soc. Am. **109**, 2587-2597 (2001)). It is pointed out that there are ambiguities with the counting method.

PACS numbers: 43.30.Gv, 43.80.Ev

In a recent paper [1], de Rosny and Roux proposed a method for counting fish in a tank, an important issue for the fisheries community. As far as we know, this is the first published report on counting fish in a tank. We recognize that the fish information may have been detected by the method. However, in its present form of data analysis, we believe that the foundations for the analysis are questionable. As a matter of fact, their approach has failed to provide reasonable scattering properties of fish. The reasons are elaborated below.

(1) The multiple scattering in a reflecting cavity. The basis for the fish counting method in [1] is described by Fig. 1 of [1]. The analysis relies on the treatment of the multiple scattering picture in this figure. In the context, the authors argued that the effect of the reflecting boundaries of a tank can be regarded as mirrors, and thus acoustic scattering in such a system is regarded as a medium of scatterers and their images without the boundaries. The multiple reflections make the system equivalent to a system of infinite size.

The first ambiguity in the later development is that effects from the images of the acoustic sources are not considered in [1]. Although the images of the sources are shown in Fig. 1, their possible effects are not discussed anywhere in [1]. In addition, the reflection from the water surface is not taken into account either. The presence of the water surface also acts as a mirror, giving rise to interactions between the scatterers and their images due to this mirror. It is worth pointing out that the water surface acts as a pressure release plane, which has different effects from the presumably total-reflecting side boundaries of the tank.

The second ambiguity lies in the way how the multiple scattering among the scatterers and the images in Fig. 1 is accounted for, a crucial problem in the analysis. In [1], the authors wrote down two formulas in Eqs. (1) and (2) for total and coherent intensity as a result of the multiple scattering; here we note that in [1] Eqs. (1) and (2) have been mistakenly regarded as the coherent intensity and incoherent intensity respectively - the detailed information about the definitions of these quantities can be referred to [2]. With reference to [2], it is ready to verify that both Eqs. (1) and (2) are actually the results of the multiple scattering when wave propagates in a cloud of *completely independent* random scatterers (Refer to, e. g. Chapter 14 in [2]). In the system such as many scatterers in a reflecting cavity, the scatterers and their images are *not* independent scatterers. Thus Eqs. (1) and (2) are not applicable to the present case. There is a rich body of literature on acoustic scattering by bodies in the presence of boundaries (e. g. [3–6]). Correlated scatterers can give rise to interference between multiply scattered waves that is absent in a group of independent scatterers. Take the simplest case of an object near a boundary as example. The multiple scattering from a scatterer and its image differs from the scattering from two actual scatterers. This can be easily inferred from, for example, Ref. [6].

(2) The mathematical derivation. The results of Ref. [1] rely mainly on its Eq. (4). In writing down this equation, the authors made the assertion "Eq. (3) can be written (as Eq. (4)) by changing from a space variable to a time variable", then Eq. (4) is obtained. But no details were given. The derivation from Eq. (3) to Eq. (4) is mathematically unclear. Eq. (3) denotes how wave is attenuated after travelling a distance, but Eq. (4) represents the time evolution of backscattered signals. The former is a *forward* propagating process, while the later is a *backscattering* process. The link between the two is not obvious. In fact, the time evolution of backscattered signals has been detailed in Chapter 5 of [2]. It is not evident how the time series of the ratio between the coherent and the total backscattered signals can be represented by a simple equation like Eq. (4).

(3) The experimental results. The method of [1] yields doubtful scattering properties of fish. The main goal of [1] is to obtain accurate total scattering cross section of fish. Two fish species are measured: zebra fish with length about 1 cm at 400 kHz and 35 cm long striped bass at 12.8 kHz. Take the bass fish as the example. According to [1], the total scattering cross section of the strip bass is $4\pi R^2$ with $R \sim 3.8$ cm, leading to $\sigma_s \sim 181$ cm^2. This value is much larger than what would be expected for a fish of 35 cm length. The reasons follow.

First, the total scattering cross section is a computable quantity. According to the optical theorem [2], the total cross section can be calculated from the imaginary part of the forward scattering function of a scatterer

$$\sigma_t = \sigma_s + \sigma_a = \frac{4\pi}{k}\mathrm{Im}[f(0)], \qquad (1)$$

where $f(0)$ is the scattering function in the forward scattering direction, σ_s and σ_a are the total scattering cross section and the absorption cross section respectively; the absorption can be caused by such effects as thermal exchange or viscosity of the scatterer. For frequencies above the resonance of the fish swimbladder like the cases considered in [1], the absorption due to the swimbladder is negligible. Furthermore the acoustic absorption due to fish bodies is also negligible. Therefore we have

$$\sigma_s \approx \sigma_t = \frac{4\pi}{k}\mathrm{Im}[f(0)]. \quad (2)$$

This applies to scattering by both fish swimbladders and fish bodies. The advances in modelling acoustic scattering by fish allow for reasonable estimates of fish scattering cross sections. Fish scattering models can be referred to, e. g., the textbook [7]. Indeed, the optical theorem has been applied to existing experimental measurements of various fish scattering cross sections, yielding encouraging agreements [8]. Applying the method in [8], we estimate that the total scattering cross section for a 35 cm long fish at 12.8 kHz is around 30 - 40 cm^2, depending on the aspect ratio used in the modelling. This is much smaller than the value obtained in [1]. It is our experience that the scattering properties vary only slightly for different fish species with the same length.

Second, there exist experimental data on acoustic scattering on fish of similar length. For example, the previous experiment data on Saithe fish of 35.1 cm length yields a total scattering cross section around 30 cm^2 [9], in the same order as the theoretical value [8]. This experiment was carried out at a frequency higher than 12.8 kHz used in [1]. From the modelling, this would lead to a slightly higher value in the total scattering cross section than that at 12.8 kHz. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the total scattering cross section for a 35 cm long fish at 12.8 kHz would be in the order of a few tens of square centimeters, which is considerably smaller than that obtained in [1].

In conclusion, the method in [1] requires further development and elaboration in order to be applicable to counting fish in an aquatic tank.

Acknowledgments Dr. P.-G. Luan is thanked for bringing Ref. [1] to our attention. We thank Dr. Tim Stanton (WHOI) for useful correspondence. The work received support from the National Science Council through a grant to ZY.

[1] J. de Rosny and P. Roux, "Multiple scattering in a reflecting cavity: Application to fish counting in a tank", J. Acoust. Soc. Am. **109**, 2587-2597 (2001).

[2] A. Ishimaru, *Wave propagation and scattering in random media*, (Academic Press, New York, 1978), Vols. I and II.

[3] J. C. Bertrand and J. W. Young, "Scattering between a cylinder and a plane", J. Acoust. Soc. Am. **60**, 1265-1269 (1976).

[4] G. C. Bishop and J. Smith, "Scattering from an elastic shell and a rough fluid-elastic interface", J. Acoust. Soc. Am. **101**, 767-788 (1997)

[5] J. A. Fawcett, W. L. J. Fox, and A. Maguer, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. **104**, 3296-3304 (1998).

[6] I. Tolstoy, "Superresonant systems of scatterers. I", J. Acoust. Soc. Am. **80**, 282-294 (1986).

[7] H. Medwin and C. S. Clay, *Acoustical Oceanography*, (Academic Press, New York, 1997).

[8] Z. Ye, "On acoustic attenuation by swimblader fish", J. Acoust. Soc. Am. **100**, 669-672 (1996)

[9] K. G. Foote, "Analysis of empirical observations on the scattering of sound by encaged aggregations of fish", Fisheridir. Skr. Ser. Havunders. **16**, 422-455 (1978).